

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 436

September 15, 1995, 1:11 p.m.
Page S-13643 Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM BILL/Cut in Federal Welfare Administrators

SUBJECT: Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 4. Glenn motion to table the Gramm modified amendment No. 2615 to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE FAILED, 49-49

SYNOPSIS: As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul 6 of the Nation's 10 largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

The Gramm modified amendment would require the Department of Health and Human Services to reduce by 75 percent the number of full-time equivalent positions related to each direct spending program and each discretionary program that would be converted into a block grant program under the Dole amendment. Further, the Department of Health and Human Services would be required to determine the proportion of managerial overhead costs those programs currently account for at the Department and then to reduce by 75 percent the number of departmental management positions for those programs. Finally, the amendment would specifically require the elimination of 245 positions related to the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program and 60 managerial positions at the Department.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Glenn moved to table the Gramm amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: The Senate subsequently agreed to the Gramm amendment (see vote No. 441).

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The Gramm amendment would make sense if block-granting welfare programs as proposed in the Dole amendment would reduce Federal Government responsibilities. Unfortunately, the Dole amendment would actually increase the need for Federal employees.

(See other side)

YEAS (49)			NAYS (49)			NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (5 or 10%)	Democrats (44 or 96%)		Republicans (47 or 90%)	Democrats (2 or 4%)		Republicans (2)	Democrats (0)
Campbell	Akaka	Johnston	Abraham	Helms	Baucus	Nickles- ² Stevens- ²	EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE 1—Official Buisiness 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay
Chafee	Biden	Kennedy	Ashcroft	Hutchison	Heflin		
Cohen	Bingaman	Kerrey	Bennett	Inhofe			
Jeffords	Boxer	Kerry	Bond	Kempthorne			
Kassebaum	Bradley	Kohl	Brown	Kyl			
	Breaux	Lautenberg	Burns	Lott			
	Bryan	Leahy	Coats	Lugar			
	Bumpers	Levin	Cochran	Mack			
	Byrd	Lieberman	Coverdell	McCain			
	Conrad	Mikulski	Craig	McConnell			
	Daschle	Moseley-Braun	D'Amato	Murkowski			
	Dodd	Moynihan	DeWine	Packwood			
	Dorgan	Murray	Dole	Pressler			
	Exon	Nunn	Domenici	Roth			
	Feingold	Pell	Faircloth	Santorum			
	Feinstein	Pryor	Frist	Shelby			
	Ford	Reid	Gorton	Simpson			
	Glenn	Robb	Gramm	Smith			
	Graham	Rockefeller	Grams	Snowe			
	Harkin	Sarbanes	Grassley	Specter			
	Hollings	Simon	Gregg	Thomas			
	Inouye	Wellstone	Hatch	Thompson			
			Hatfield	Thurmond			
				Warner			

Currently, less than 1 percent of the staff administering these programs are found at the Federal level. The Dole amendment would increase this percentage with its numerous new requirements for the Department of Health and Human Services. The Dole amendment would order the Department to provide technical assistance to hundreds of Indian tribes, and to gather, compile, evaluate, and disseminate data on a larger scale than it currently must. Current law imposes 5 data collection and evaluation requirements; the Dole amendment would impose 16 such requirements. Given that the Dole amendment would actually increase responsibilities at the Federal level it does not make any sense to reduce the number of Federal employees. We therefore urge our colleagues to join us in tabling the Gramm amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

This bill will result in the Federal Government transferring control over welfare to the States. Most notably, it will result in the elimination of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program. What then, will happen to the bureaucrats who administer the program? Common sense tells us that their jobs should be eliminated, but common sense is often in short supply in the Senate. We imagine that any private business, and virtually every State or local government, would eliminate these jobs without question. In the Senate though, many Members have palpitations at the thought of actually reducing the size of the Federal Government. Therefore, in proposing the Gramm amendment, we have not asked for the elimination of 100 percent of the positions for the programs that will be block-granted; instead, we have asked for the termination of only 75 percent of the bureaucrats running these soon-to-be defunct programs. Our colleagues are still not satisfied. In fact, they have argued that it will take more personnel, not less, to monitor rather than to administer these programs. It could, but only if we let it. Given the opportunity, we have no doubt that the Department of Health and Human Services could devise ways to hire legions of bureaucrats to regulate the States in minute detail, destroying the value of block-granting these programs. We oppose that result, and thus support the Gramm amendment.